

that there are over 500,000 Brownfield sites across the country in need of cleanup and remediation. Brownfields represent more than just eyesores blighting individual communities. They threaten our groundwater supply, cost our local communities jobs and revenue, and contribute to urban sprawl.

Unfortunately, the largest obstacle cities face when redeveloping Brownfields sites is the lack of capital needed to carry out essential early-stage activities such as site-assessment, remediation planning, and actual clean-up. Because private financiers are often unwilling or unable to provide the funding to take a site through the full redevelopment cycle, local municipalities and local leaders find themselves confronted with the complex task of redevelopment. The Brownfield Economic Development Initiative or BEDI grant program was designed to help cities overcome this challenge. The HUD program was created in 1998 to provide flexible funds for any stage of the revitalization process, from site assessment and clean up to economic development.

Current law makes the BEDI grant difficult to utilize. If a local community wishes to pursue clean-up and redevelopment funds from HUD, they must first apply for a Section 108 loan. In order to secure this loan, they are required to put up a portion of their Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) money as collateral. Few cities are willing to tie up these funds on a loan guarantee—especially in the early stages of a Brownfields redevelopment. Tying up CDBG funds means a city may be forced to discontinue other programs which benefit low to moderate-income residents in order to pursue a riskier redevelopment project. For instance, CDBG funds are used to provide important community services such as Meals on Wheels and child care programs. Without the Section 108 loan guarantee, cities are effectively locked out of the BEDI grant.

The Brownfields Redevelopment Enhancement Act remedies this problem by de-linking the BEDI grant program from the Section 108 loan guarantee and clarifying that CDBG funds may be used for Brownfields redevelopment. In addition, the bill creates a pilot program for a revolving loan pool for Brownfields redevelopment. As a result, cities will have new options—they can proceed, as under current law, by applying for a Section 108 loan, to be secured by a portion of their CDBG funds, and then apply for a BEDI grant; they can simply apply for a BEDI grant; they can apply for pilot program funds; or they can use any combination of the above which best meets their project needs. With the flexible access to such government funding, we can help revitalize Brownfields sites across the country.

It is important to point out the benefits cities will receive under this legislation. First, there will be a direct, positive effect on the environment when the sites are cleaned up. Second, cities have an opportunity to minimize urban sprawl and preserve existing green space by working with local developers and builders to utilize previously developed properties. Due to the liability associated with Brownfields, many developers currently opt to purchase and plan projects on open space. This bill will empower cities to take ownership of their Brownfields and work with their development community to design projects that utilize existing infrastructure. Most importantly, it is estimated that up to \$2.4 billion in new tax revenues can be generated through Brownfields redevelopment.

The goal of H.R. 2941 is to make two existing HUD programs work better for the communities they are intended to serve. In speaking with my local mayors, I learned that communities in my district are currently locked out of the BEDI grant program. The city manager of the City of La Habra, California, which is in my district, has stated that this bill "would only further assist the City's efforts in pursuing the clean-up of environmentally contaminated sites." I assure you that many of my colleagues will hear similar sentiments from community leaders in their districts.

Let's give cities access to the up-front financing they need to clean up Brownfields sites. I urge expeditious consideration of this crucial legislation.

A TRIBUTE TO LILLIAN WOOD FOR 50 YEARS OF SERVICE WITH THE MARINE CORPS

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 2003

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like today to pay tribute to Mrs. Lillian Wood, who is well-known in many of our offices as the "go-to" person to provide service and answers to constituents who are Marines or former Marines. After 50 years of service as a civilian with the U.S. Marine Corps, Mrs. Wood is retiring as head of the Legislative Affairs Correspondence Branch.

As you and my colleagues know, when our constituents decide to "call my Congressman" to fix a problem, we turn to the agencies involved to help us with that solution. During her several decades with the Marine Corps legislative affairs office, Mrs. Wood helped tens of thousands of our constituents gain satisfaction, and she has become a shining example of a government official dedicated to public service.

A native of East Millsboro, Pennsylvania, Lillian went to work for the Marine Corps as a clerk-typist in 1952, not long after her high school graduation. She soon moved up to clerk-stenographer and began a quick ascent in the Marine Corps support services. From 1955 to 1966, she served with the Marine Corps dental/administrative division, and later with the reserve, aviation and G-4 divisions.

Her supervisors were so impressed with her business administration acumen that in 1966 Mrs. Wood was asked to join the Special Correspondence Branch of the Manpower and Reserve Affairs Department, formerly the Personnel Department. She was ultimately responsible for 28 employees in that department, and advanced to assistant branch head before her assignment to the legislative affairs correspondence branch.

Because of her personal integrity and the utmost respect and confidence she receives from the Corps, Mrs. Wood ensures that the Marines speak with one voice to congressional offices. She serves as the focal point for more than 4,000 written inquiries sent each year from Members of Congress. Her understanding of the needs of the average Marine and former Marine has been vital not only to our offices, but to the Secretary to the Navy, the Bureau of Medical Surgery and other military services.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in thanking Lillian Wood for 50 years of dedicated service with the Marine Corps, for showing exemplary leadership and inspirational service that set the standard for civilian service in the Corps and the United States Naval Service. We wish her well in her retirement.

HATE SUCCEEDS IN INDIA

HON. DAN BURTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 2003

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, there was an interesting article in the Washington Post on December 11. It shows that hate can be a winning platform in India.

The article focuses on Jeetubhai Waghela, a candidate of the ruling BJP in the recent elections. He was involved in the killings in Gujarat last year, according to Muslims there. Now he runs as a protector of Hindus and this platform of hatred gains votes for him.

The Indian government has oppressed minorities for many years. In 1984, almost 20 years ago, it invaded the Golden Temple in Amritsar, the most sacred of Sikh shrines. Since then, over 250,000 Sikhs have been murdered by the government, according to figures from the Punjab State Magistracy. 52,268 Sikhs are being held as political prisoners, according to a study from the Movement Against State Repression. These political prisoners should be released immediately.

The government was directly involved in the murders in Gujarat last year, according to published reports in India. It has killed over 85,000 Kashmiri Muslims as well as Muslims throughout the country. Over 200,000 Christians have been killed in Nagaland. Since Christmas 1998, priests have been murdered, nuns have been raped, churches have been burned, and Christian schools and prayer halls have been attacked. Missionary Graham Staines and his two young sons were burned to death while they slept in their Jeep. Police broke up a religious festival with gunfire. These acts have been carried out by government forces or by their Hindu nationalist allies with government connivance. Is this a democracy?

We can help stop hate in the subcontinent. We must cut off our aid to India and we must come out for a free and fair plebiscite on independence in Kashmir, as India promised in 1948, as well as in Khalistan, in Nagaland, and the other countries seeking their freedom from India. Self-determination is the right of all peoples and nations, Mr. Speaker. That was the principle on which America is founded. It must be the principle that we promote around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to place the Washington Post article I referred to into the RECORD at this time.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 11, 2002]

IN INDIAN ELECTION, HATE IS PART OF PLATFORM

(By Rama Lakshmi)

AHMEDABAD, India—The candidate marched down the slum's narrow lanes, followed by men dancing to the sound of loud drums and

spraying the streets with marigold petals. Hindu women paused from their chores of peeling garlic and doing laundry to offer garlands and blessings.

The cheerful scene, part of Jeetubhai Waghela's campaign for a seat in the state legislature, played out beneath a cloth banner that revealed a more ominous aspect of the coming election here in India's western state of Gujarat. The banner vows to avenge the killing of 58 Hindus during an attack on a train by Muslims last February, and as the supporters of Waghela, a member of the Hindu-nationalist Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), pressed forward and choked the alleys, Muslim residents quickly hurried indoors.

"Here comes the lion," roared Waghela's men.

Nine months ago, as Gujarat was being riven by religious violence that followed the killing of the Hindus, Waghela stormed the same streets with a mob of Hindu men wearing orange bandanas and armed with swords, sticks and gasoline, according to witnesses and police records. Shouting angry slogans at Muslim residents, Waghela allegedly ordered the mob to loot and destroy their homes, leaving them homeless for months.

"For three days, Waghela and his men looted and burnt our homes. For eight months, we lived in relief camps because of him," said Nasir Khan, a complainant. "Now he tells Hindus he is their protector against us. Where do we run for cover if he gets elected?"

After a Muslim mob in the town of Godhra killed 58 Hindu train passengers in February, more than 1,000 people died, most of them Muslim, in weeks of arson and killing throughout Gujarat. Human rights groups have accused the BJP—the ruling party in Gujarat as well as in India's national government—of essentially ignoring the killings by its Hindu extremist allies.

As Gujarat prepares to elect a new state legislature on Thursday, many analysts are describing the vote as an important test of the secular foundations of India's religiously and ethnically diverse democracy.

In a state where only 9 percent of the population of 50 million is Muslim, the BJP is counting on sectarian passions to consolidate the Hindu vote. Throughout the state, BJP leaders have delivered fiery speeches against Muslims involved in the Feb. 27 attack and against Pakistan-aided Islamic militants killing Hindus in the revolt-wracked province of Jammu and Kashmir.

One such party stalwart is Waghela, who was arrested in connection with this year's riots on four charges, including murder and rioting. Jailed for 108 days and now free on bail, Waghela, 31, is back here in Gomtipur, a mixed working-class neighborhood in Ahmedabad, with folded hands, asking for votes for the BJP. He denies playing a role in the riots and insists he was framed.

Campaigning on a recent morning, Waghela identified a new target of hate for his Hindu voters. Climbing on a platform, he told them that a fancy new high-rise for Muslims is being planned adjacent to their homes, on the site of a closed textile mill. He warned them that they would not be safe any longer.

"You will be surrounded from all sides by Muslims," said Waghela, breathlessly flicking back his hair from his forehead. "Don't let them gain power over you. Vote for me and I will stop that building plan."

"Do you want the building here?" he said. "No!" the crowd shouted back.

This election is critical to the political destiny of the BJP, which has suffered defeats in several state elections in the past two years. Gujarat is the last major state in which the party holds power, and critics fear

that it could use a victory here as an endorsement of strident Hindu politics. The national coalition that the BJP leads in New Delhi under Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee will face the polls in 2004.

"In this election, the BJP is seeking a legitimization of violence that its members indulged in against the Muslims," said Achyut Yagnik, a political analyst and social worker in Gujarat. "The results in Gujarat will determine whether they take this appeal of Hindutva [Hindu chauvinism] beyond Gujarat."

The BJP's main challenger in Gujarat—and at the national level—is the Congress party, which attacks the BJP's Hindu fundamentalism for endangering the lives and rights of India's religious minorities. As a result, Gujarat's Muslims and Christians have rallied behind Congress, while many Hindu voters in Gujarat feel that Congress, headed at the national level by the Italian-born Sonia Gandhi, has an anti-Hindu slant and defends only the religious minorities.

Opinion polls show that it is likely to be a close contest between the BJP and Congress. Some secular analysts said that although Hindu voters may find the demagoguery of the BJP attractive, the social divisions inherent in the caste system may prevent Hindus from voting as a bloc.

The Muslims of Gujarat, on the other hand, appear to have decided to vote en masse for Congress. Yet many complained that Congress took their support for granted and often forgot them when attaining power. They will vote for Congress, they say, simply because they have no other choice.

Nowhere is this frustration felt more sharply than in Godhra, the epicenter of Gujarat's religious strife.

The BJP's candidate in Godhra, Haresh Bhatt, campaigns under banners of the burning train, distributes pictures of the dead Hindu passengers and describes the election as a "religious war." But the Congress candidate there, Rajendra Singh Patel, many Muslims said, was involved in burning the shops and homes of Muslims in March.

"We made two appeals to the Congress last month not to field Patel in the elections, but they still made him the candidate," said Mohammad Yusaf, 56, a clerk in the city government. "But we are caught between a ditch and a well. To defeat the BJP, we will have to vote for Patel. But our heart is not in it."

THE HOUSING BOND AND CREDIT MODERNIZATION AND FAIRNESS ACT OF 2003

HON. AMO HOUGHTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 2003

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague from Massachusetts, Representative RICHARD NEAL, in introducing our bill, "The Housing Bond and Credit Modernization and Fairness Act of 2003". My collaboration with Mr. NEAL today is indicative of the broad bipartisan support Housing Bonds and the Low Income Housing Tax Credit (Housing Credit) programs enjoy.

The Congress has a golden opportunity, without creating any new program or asking for any appropriation of Federal money, to create new housing opportunity for tens of thousands of low- and moderate-income families every year. All it will take is enactment of simple legislation to eliminate obsolete provisions

in the two principal federal programs that finance the production of affordable housing: Housing Bonds, or single-family Mortgage Revenue Bonds, MRBs, as they are commonly known, and the Housing Credit.

This bill is identical to the one Representative NEAL and I introduced in the 107th Congress, which earned the support of 360 House cosponsors from both parties, from all regions of the country, and from rural and urban districts.

The Housing Bond and Credit Modernization and Fairness Act of 2003 would do three things.

First, the bill would repeal the Ten-Year Rule, a provision added to the MRB program in 1988 that prevents states from using homeowner payments on such mortgages to make new mortgages to additional qualified purchasers. For each day the Ten-Year Rule is in effect, states lose millions of dollars in financing for first-time home buyer mortgages, amounting to more than \$12 billion in mortgage authority between 2001 and 2005. This represents nearly half of the entire Bond cap increase Congress enacted in 2000. Our bill would eliminate the Ten-Year Rule to allow states to use mortgage payments to finance additional lower income mortgages.

Second, the bill would replace the present unworkable limit on the price of the homes these mortgages can finance with a simple limit that works. No reliable comprehensive data exists to determine average area home prices. The current price limits were issued in 1994 based on 1993 data. They are obsolete and well below current home price levels in most parts of the country. Many qualified buyers simply cannot find homes that are priced below the outdated limits.

The answer is to replace the present limit, set in Washington, by a simple formula limiting the purchase price to three and a half times the qualifying income under the program.

Finally, the bill makes Housing Credit apartment production viable in rural areas by allowing statewide median incomes as the basis for the income limits in that program. This change would apply the same methodology for determining qualifying income levels used in the MRB Program. HUD data shows that current income limits inhibit Housing Credit development in more than 1,300 nonmetropolitan counties across the country.

I am pleased to tell my colleagues that the changes proposed by the Housing Bond and Credit Modernization and Fairness Act of 2003 have been endorsed by the bipartisan National Governors Association, the National Council of State Housing Agencies, and every major national housing organization. These groups know how important the Housing Bond and Housing Credit programs are in giving states the ability to meet the housing needs of low- and moderate-income families.

Today, I ask you to join in a bipartisan effort to see that these important provisions are enacted as part of tax legislation this year.

TRIBUTE TO PAUL B. HIGGINBOTHAM

HON. TAMMY BALDWIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 2003

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Paul B. Higginbotham, a Dane